DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 081 FL 019 050

AUTHOR Sunderland, Jane; Toncheva, Elizabeth
TITLE The Value of Project Work in INSET.
PUB DATE 10 Jan 91
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (24th, Dublin, Ireland, March 27-30, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Participant Satisfaction; Secondary Education; *Second Language Programs; *Student Projects; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Institute for English Language Education (England)

ABSTRACT

Project Work is increasingly being used in In-service Teacher Education courses for English-as-a-foreign-language teachers for the purposes of both language improvement and learning about English language teaching. At the Institute for English Language Education, Lancaster University, the intended purpose of Project Work is primarily the latter. However, a questionnaire study of INSET course tutors and participants that showed Project Work to be well received also indicated it to be of value largely because it addresses the INSET participant in several roles, i.e., as teacher of English, teacher of learners, researcher, learner of English, writer, and INSET course participant. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328081

The Value of Project Work in INSET

Jane Sunderland
Institute for English Language Education
Lancaster University
Lancaster LA1 4YN

and

Elizabeth Toncheva
Surrey Language Centres
39 West St.
Farnham
Surrey

January 10 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Sunderland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL019050

Title: The Value of Project Work in INSET

Abstract

Project Work is increasingly being used on In-service Teacher Education courses for EFL teachers for the purposes of both language improvement and learning about ELT. At the Institute for English Language Education, Lancaster University, the intended purpose of Project Work is primarily the latter. However a questionnaire study of INSET course tutors and participants which showed Project Work to be well-received also indicated it to be of value largely because it addresses the INSET participant in several different roles, i.e. as teacher of English, teacher of learners, researcher, learner of English, writer and INSET course participant. It thus nears an approach catering to the participant as a whole person. While this may in principle be desirable, it may however be that some of these roles are not as beneficial as others, and that the roles of 'Participant as researcher' and 'Participant as writer' are particularly problematic. Requiring the INSET participant to play these roles may be to impose an unnecessary and limiting straitjacket, and that what is needed is accordingly a form of organisation which allows greater flexibility in both the process and format of Project Work.

The Value of Project Work in INSET

The learner-centred methodology of Project Work, familiar in mother tongue and foreign language education, is now becoming familiar in teacher education (see Carter and Thomas, 1986 and Moon, 1990). At the Institute for English Language Education (IELE), Lancaster University, Project Work is a component of almost all teacher education courses, and in this article we explore the particular question of the value of Project Work in INSET, using the results of a questionnaire study of INSET participants and tutors. Project Work in INSET at IELE may be seen as a case study, from which tentative generalisations about value can then be made.

We will first briefly describe Project Work as it is used on our INSET courses.

What is Project Work in INSET like at IELE?

(a) The courses and the participants:

The INSET courses we are concerned with here are 'The Communicative Teaching of English', 'ESP Teacher Training' (both 10-week Certificate courses) and the nine-month 'Diploma in Advanced Studies in Education (ELT)'. The participants are experienced teachers of English of different nationalities, mostly from Third World countries.

(b) Rationale for Project Work:

Good pedagogic reasons for Project Work can be put forward for most courses. Let us here simply say that, first and foremost, we have seen it as beneficial for the participants' learning about ELT. The course handout about the Project which participants receive states that

> The Course Project is...intended to give you the opportunity to research and write on a topic in which you have a special interest, and which is likely to be particularly relevant to your home teaching situation.

Both considerations are important--the first to motivate, the second to provide something directly or indirectly useful when the participant returns home.

There are three further, covert reasons for having a project component in these INSET courses. The first is that some participants will be able to use Project Work with their own students (indeed, some already have) (1). But because many will not, due to contraints imposed by the syllabus, the textbook, the examination system and expectations and requirements of their immediate superiors, colleagues and students, it is nowhere stated that participants can experience Project Work methodology as something they may wish to use back home. Participants may, however, build such a purpose into their own professional and learning agendas while on the course.

The second (and secondary) covert reason is that Project Work provides an opportunity for further development of participants' language proficiency:

> [Projects] produce new language learning data; they collect and organise new language, new information, which can be used for further language learning (Candlin and Edelhoff, 1982: 29).

The third reason is logistic as well as pedagogic: Project Work makes it possible to handle a wide range of participant needs, abilities, expectations and interests within the structure of a single course.

We have come to believe that any binary classification of the benefits of Project Work in INSET courses into 'learning about ELT' and 'language improvement' is neither very accurate nor very helpful. As we hope to show further, the purposes and values of Project Work cannot be so neatly classified.

(c) The Project as an assignment:

The Project is a compulsory part of the course. Around 1,500 words in length, it is the third, and longest of three assignments (2). It should not, however, be just a 'long essay', informed by different books and articles. As stated on the handout, some 'research' is also required.

(d) The Project topic:

The topic of the Project in the courses in question must be ELT-related, and this is where it seems to differ from that required in many other INSET courses, including many of IELE's own short pre-service and INSET courses, whose participants are typically groups of teachers of the same nationality . Project topics on these short courses are usually cultural, e.g. 'Ghosts in Lancaster pubs', 'What imported foods are available in Lancaster Shops?' and 'What do people in Lancaster know about [name of participants' country]?' (see also Carter and Thomas, 1986).

Our 10-week and Diploma INSET courses, however, are primarily concerned with ELT, rather than having as major components language improvement and/or 'British culture'; an ELT-related topic therefore best reflects these courses' focus.

(d) The Project as a process:

The process of doing the Project is as important as the final product, if not more so, and participants are made aware of this from the start. Accordingly, the process is a lengthy, serious and demanding one, requiring energy and commitment from participants and tutors alike. The stages in general are as follows.

The participant:

(1) receives a 'Project Proposal Form'
(2) decides topic and completes the form
(3) is allocated a Project tutor
(4) reads, makes notes, may do original research and writes first and possibly other pre-final drafts, with guidance from the tutor
(5) produces final product and gives it in
(6) gets Project back, with feedback
(7) presents the Project to the group in a 'Project Bazaar'

Some of the above need further explanation.

The participant's Project tutor is usually someone who has a particular interest in the participant's chosen topic. It is the Project tutor's responsibility to help his or her tutee modify the topic, and narrow it down to a manageable scale, if necessary, as well as to provide guidance and support throughout the Project Work. The tutor is also involved in the marking of the Project.

Each participant sees the tutor individually at three timetabled Project Tutorials, and whenever new needs or questions arise.

After the first meeting, several processes happen: the participant reads and drafts, he or she may do some small-scale research, and the tutor will often read drafts and give feedback. (Participants usually work on their Projects individually, although two or more participants sometimes collaborate.) Most participants write one preliminary draft then produce the final product, taking into consideration tutor feedback.

The final product may include characteristic features of academic written texts such as acknowledgements, a table of contents, references in the text, a bibliography, and one or more appendices. These are not obligatory; whether or not they appear in the final version depends primarily on the

purpose of the project, and secondarily on tutor and participant preferences.

This final product is handed in at the end of Week 9 of the course, providing relief for most participants and a demanding weekend for tutors. The Projects are then handed back to the participants with full feedback--and, if they are to be 'Certificated', a grade.

The 'Project Bazaar' is the final stage. In this plenary session all participants, with the aid of a poster made the previous day, talk for just two or three minutes about the 'essence' of their Project: what they have found out or produced, the process of doing this, or both. There are many reasons for this session (3) but probably the most important and most widely shared among tutors is that it forces the participant to think clearly about what his or her Project has <u>really</u> been about, this in anticipation of having to talk or answer questions about it on returning home.

<u>Investigating the Value of Project Work</u>

To investigate the value of Project Work in INSET on the courses in question, we issued two questionnaires to thirty-six INSET participants, one, in November 1989, while they were still in the process of doing their Project and the other in early December after they had finished. We also issued a different set of questionnaires to course tutors. These were all intended to tap <u>perceived</u> value of the Project Work. (All questionnaires were completed anonymously.)

We have also sent a third questionnaire to ex-IELE students who had attended an INSET course over the last two years to find out what use, if any, their Project Work has <u>actually</u> been to them. These questionnaires are still being returned.

Selected results of the first two participant questionnaires and the tutor questionnaires are summarised below. While not all findings pertain directly to 'value', most have some bearing on it.

(a) Previous experience (participants)

The thirty-six participants were secondary and tertiary English language teachers from twenty countries in Africa, Asia, South America and Europe. On average, they had around five years teaching experience.

Six respondents had used Project Work in their teaching, but none had done Project Work as part of an INSET course before. All but one claimed to have had some previous experience of academic writing, but most (nineteen) had only 'a little'--which was not necessarily in English. The Project thus presented a fairly formidable writing task--a question we will return to shortly.

(b) Initial reactions and reason for topic choice (participants)

Of the nine positive and negative initial reactions to the Project Work which we suggested, of which participants could tick as many as they felt were true, the most frequently selected were 'Seeing it as a challenge' (the most frequently expressed reason for this being 'Could explore new ideas') and 'Anxiety' (the most frequently expressed reason being 'Unsure of what exactly you were supposed to do'). Both 'Seeing it as a challenge' and 'Anxiety' were indicated twenty-six times out of the possible thirty-six. Most participants thus appeared to have felt distinctly ambivalent at the outset--hardly surprising, since a Project was something new for most, and for most it was to be assessed (4).

Questionnaires also indicated that 'personal/professional interest/want' was a more likely criterion for selection of topic than 'professional need or lack'--though both scored highly, being ticked by twenty-nine and twenty-one respondents respectively. (Participants could again tick as many

of the given reasons as they felt applied (5).) The relative popularity of the former may be the result of participants being newly familiarised with certain areas of Applied Linguistics/TEFL, which took precedence over the other strong desire--to do something of direct relevance to the home teaching situation.

(c) Perceived usefulness (participants)

When asked about the usefulness of Project Work in the course (one measure of value), eighteen participants (i.e. half the group) replied that it was one of the most useful aspects of the course, fourteen, that it was averagely useful, and four, that it was the least useful aspect. In response to whether Project Work was more useful to participants as advanced learners of English, or as teachers of English, 33 of the 36 chose the latter. We then asked the people who had chosen this to say how it was useful. Responses included the following:

"I can apply some of the ideas in my home teaching situation."
"It helps me be a better test writer which is part of my job as a teacher."
"I now have clearer ideas about teaching than while I am reading books."
"It is something I will carry out when I go back home."
"I have learnt how to design my own reading materials."
"My topic requires thinking about ways of making learning in large classes more pleasant and effective and teaching less exhausting." (5)

These responses were reassuring in the light of the fact that the INSET courses and Project in question are indeed about developing materials and methodology appropriate to the home teaching situation, but they did not seem to fully tap the reason why Project Work seemed to produce still other largely positive responses. No respondent, for example, had any difficulty in identifying in some detail how they were most benefitting from their Project; further, twenty participants claimed that doing the Project had affected their self-esteem positively. The reason why Project Work seems to be favourably received and perceived as useful, if abstracted and

generalisable, is surely of interest to all Project Work practitioners. Answers to a question on the tutor questionnaire pointed us in what seemed like a productive direction.

(d) Perceived purposes (tutors)

One of the questions on the Tutor Questionnaire was

"What do you consider the main purposes of Project Work in INSET? Please list them below."

This question produced answers too numerous to be listed--some very similar, some overlapping and some very different. This could be considered not only surprising but also of some concern, since all these tutors were working within the same team. Alternatively, it could be interpreted as tutors perceiving or recognising different facets of Project Work, pointing to the value of Project Work in the sense of richness of potential. We attempted to classify the purposes, and intuitively (using our combination of tutor and ex-student intuition) grouped together those responses which seemed similar in content. This produced six groups to which we attached six headings. These are given below, with examples of purposes identified:

(1) Professional development in ELT

Example 1: to produce something concrete and usable in participant's Home Teaching Situation
Example 2: to increase participant's depth of understanding in a particular area

(2) Learning about learning

Example 1: learn by doing
Example 2: learn through enquiry
Example 3: become (more) aware of a different approach to learning
Example 4: appreciate learner's perspective in Project Work

(3) Doing research:

Example 1: achieve something original
Example 2: do a little original small-scale research
Example 3: develop research interests
Example 4: see the value of small-scale research

(4) Learning more English

Example 1: develop independent study skills
Example 2: have integrated skills practice
Example 3: be stretched intellectually

(5) Writing

Example: for the participant to do an extended piece of academic writing

(6) The INSET course

Example 1: to synthesise different aspects of the course
Example 2: to enable the participant to use resources not available at home
Example 3: to provide a focus
Example 4: to provide an opportunity for the participant to reflect and to find solutions to pedagogic problems
Example 5: to give the participant a sense of worth and achievement

So what is happening here, with these six different groups of purposes? We don't think the different groups are a product only of our reading, though the list of groups is clearly a structure we have imposed on the list of purposes. A different reading would doubtless produce a different arrangement of purposes, with other headings, and perhaps more or fewer than six groups--but these would still be <u>different</u> groups under <u>different</u> headings.

One thing that seems to be happening is that Project Work is addressing the participant in (if you accept our number of groupings, and the headings) six different roles, i.e., respectively:

teacher of English
teacher of learners
researcher
learner of English
writer
INSET course participant

While different groupings may yield different participant roles, these, we suggest, would be unlikely to differ greatly from the above, <u>and would still be different roles</u>.

Part of the explanation for this range of roles may be a tendency for each tutor to orient his or her tutees towards the role(s) he or she favours. Another part of the explanation, however, may be that because Project Work in INSET in the courses in question (and, if this is generalisable, in other INSET as well as language courses), addresses the participant in these different roles, with their different professional, cognitive and affective aspects, it comes somewhere near addressing the participant as a whole person. Herein may lie its greatest value. The 'whole person' idea could shed light on the reason why Project Work tends to be well-received by participants--it is simply intrinsically more satisfying than other 'methodologies' and activities. It would also provide an important, additional explanation for the large number of purposes for Project Work identified by tutors (interestingly, no tutor's purposes fell within only one group).

The Right Roles?

It would be short-sighted to stop there and congratulate ourselves that our Project Work reaches parts of participants that other 'methodologies' do not. Though it may seem desirable to address the participant in several roles, are these roles the best ones? Are they all even appropriate? While the desirability of four of the roles--teacher of English, teacher of learners, learner of English and INSET course participant--seems indisputable, the other two, 'participant as researcher' and 'participant as writer' are more problematic. Each begs the question 'Should an INSET participant be acting in this role?' Responses to the participant questionnaires illustrate our reservations.

The Participant as Researcher

Though Project Work in general is associated with learner creativity (see, for example, Hutchinson, 1985: iii), the idea of an INSET participant being a researcher seems to go further, moving into the area of originality, something participants were clearly concerned about. When asked what they found the most negative aspect of Project Work, two answers were:

> "A lot of reading will make me not use my own ideas."
> "Creating my originality and writing in my own language [words] is the most difficult."

In the questionnaire completed after the Project, twelve out of the thirty-six participants reported having felt they had no original ideas. Further, only nine participants felt that what they had done was mainly develop their own original ideas--this in contrast to the sixteen who felt that they had mainly been applying other people's ideas to their home teaching situation.

For the majority, then, it appears that originality was not one of the main results of the Project.

Originality can of course take many forms, including creating teaching materials appropriate to a particular teaching/learning situation, and proposing and developing a new approach. Developing a series of Integrated Skills units, for example, would be an original approach to EFL in countries where learning English has traditionally consisted of intensive reading and translation. From their responses, those tutors who see Project Work addressing participants as researchers (and it was not all tutors) seem to have in mind small-scale classroom research (e.g. observing classroom events, recording and transcribing classroom talk, interviewing learners), interviews (e.g. with language teachers, teacher trainers and other ELT specialists) and/or surveys (e.g. of course participants' attitudes).

This sort of Project research certainly has the advantage of having the participant engage with data that is clearly his or her 'own'. However, it is also locating the Project in an 'academic' arena, especially as the data cannot with satisfaction be left as an Appendix or even a chapter: it has to be referred to, quoted from, and generally integrated with the rest of the work. All these may be new skills for the participant and may thus divert energy and attention from where they could be more usefully applied, i.e. to the more immediate concerns and demands of the home teaching situation. Addressing the participant in the role of 'researcher' may thus not be as unproblematically a good thing as it first appears in terms of its appropriacy for a teacher development course.

The Participant as Writer

The role of 'participant as writer' should not be underestimated, for positive and negative reasons.

First, the final product may be the longest piece of writing the participant has ever produced in English; as such, it can be a source both of pride and satisfaction, and of anxiety. One participant's expressed reason for anxiety on first learning s/he would have to do a Project was "Unsure if I could write such a long paper"; another perceived the role of the tutor as "Someone who will reduce my frustration about essay writing". Writing was also identified as the 'most difficult' aspect of doing the Project by nine participants, a not insignificant proportion, who commented as indicated below:

What are you finding the most difficult aspect of your Project?

(1) Organising, writing the information down
(2) Writing
(3) To organise different ideas into coherent parts
(4) Creating my originality and writing in my own language [words]
(5) To fill up 2000 words
(6) I have much to say and I find it difficult to organise everything within the constraints of the word limit.

(7) The writing itself. I have difficulty putting my ideas into written words.
(8) Expressing my ideas well.
(9) How to put my ideas in an orderly way.

On the other hand, five participants identified writing as what benefitted them most:

Please write one sentence saying how you are most benefitting from doing your Project.

(1) I developed confidence to write 2000 words in English.
(2) Structure and research for academic writing.
(3) To have experienced how hard it is to write papers in English [?].
(4) I could get a clear idea about the processes used in writing.
(5) Improving my own writing ability ....

Further, two of the three people who said they were benefitting from the Project mostly as advanced learners of English (rather than as teachers) gave the writing of the Project as the reason for this:

> "Whether I achieve it or not, it is worthwhile to try to write an academic paper according to the British way of developing ideas."

> "It provides me with a valuable opportunity to learn how to organise chapters, paragraphs and sentences so that they make sense."

Writing is clearly an aspect of Project Work that features strongly in our participants' perception of Project Work, and, as we have seen, is likely to be a mixed blessing for them. It is also something of a dilemma for the tutor. Twenty-three of the thirty-six participants saw reading and commenting on pre-final drafts as part of the Project tutor's role, but tutors vary in the way and degree to which they carry this out. So, to what extent should the tutor edit to the point of correcting pre-final drafts? Two points are relevant here. First, though the final grade is for ideas, not language, problems with the latter in the Project will not show the former to advantage. Interestingly (and both a cause for concern and possible pointer to future action), participants given low grades often present their Projects well orally in the 'Project Bazaar', suggesting that if their oral rather than written 'performance' had been assessed, their

result would have been different. Secondly, if Project Work is intended to allow the participant to give full rein to his or her autonomy, where does the Project tutor's constructive, productive guidance become unacceptable spoonfeeding, or even propagandising, and how does the second marker or external examiner recognise a Project which is the Project tutor's rather than the participant's?

The writing and research both raise the problematic question of just how academic an INSET course Project should be. Should we insist on full and accurate referencing, a complete Bibliography, carefully justified claims and a clear distinction between what is personal opinion and what is not? Participants seem to see the Project very much as a piece of academic writing (and this perception obviously does not come out of the blue). However, leaving aside bureaucratic requirements and contraints, perhaps less-academic and non-academic, as well as largely non-written final products should be considered and encouraged as being as valid as academic, written ones. This would ensure that the participant's own decision about format (and, correspondingly, process) paralleled his or her decision about topic.

It seems to us, therefore, that it is not enough to say 'The value of Project Work in INSET lies in the fact that it addresses the participant in many different roles' without looking closely at these roles, and at whether any need modifying or even replacing. There is nothing sacrosanct about the roles of 'participant as researcher' or 'participant as writer'. The former could alternate with, among other roles, 'participant as materials designer'; the latter could perhaps become 'participant as communicator', allowing non-written products--exhibitions, videotapes, demonstrations--always assuming that existing structures permit this kind of flexibility. However, the roles of 'researcher' and 'writer' may become sacrosanct, as the following, final exploration illustrates.

* * * * * * *

Different perceptions of participant roles and purposes make it not only impossible but also pointless to attempt to define the particular 'soft situation' of 'Project Work in INSET'. However, it is possible to ask what its characteristics are, as perceived by one or more interested groups. We asked a second group of INSET participants midway through their Project Work (again, informed rather than naive Project-doers) to brainstorm 'characteristics' of Project Work. Synthesised (by us) into a paragraph these read as follows:

> [Project Work is] an extended, structured piece of work on a manageable topic defined by personal choice that is useful to the home teaching situation. It requires personal effort, theoretical background, research, creativity and academic writing skills. It is done outside as well as inside the classroom and can be done individually or in groups.

What strikes us most forcibly about this description is that though topic is 'defined by personal choice', processes or format are not so mentioned: on the contrary, the required format is 'writing' and that writing is 'academic'. This corresponds to one of the roles extrapolated from the tutor-perceived purposes, i.e. 'participant as writer'. Of the other five roles, only two appear in the description: 'participant as teacher of English' ('useful to the home teaching situation') and 'participant as researcher' ('It requires...research'). The two roles we have identified as problematic in our Project Work, 'participant as writer' and 'participant as researcher', thus appear as fixed and salient to these Project-doers. Though problematic, they seem to have become institutionalised.

If Project Work in INSET is to realise its full potential, it may then be necessary to rethink purposes and participant roles in order to achieve greater flexibility of process and format. These seem to be the two areas that merit future attention by INSET course planners and tutors.

Jane Sunderland and Elizabeth Toncheva

We would like to thank colleagues Terry Bray, Tom Hutchinson, Metta Limpongsa and Alan Waters for commenting on different drafts of this article.

Bibliography

Candlin, C. and C. Edelhoff. 1982. *Challenges: Teacher's Guide*. Harlow: Longman.

Carter, G. and H. Thomas. 1986. ''Dear Brown Eyes': Experiential Learning in a Project-Orientated Approach'. *ELT Journal* 40/3.

Hutchinson, T. 1985. *Project English: Teacher's Book*. Oxford: OUP.

Moon, J. 1990. 'Training primary teachers in Bhutan'. *English Studies* 2.

Murillo, D.P. 1989. 'Project work: a useful tool for the *Reforma* in Spain'. *Lancaster Lines* 1.

Waters, A. *et al*. 1990. 'Getting the most out of the 'language learning experience'.' *ELT Journal* 44/4.

Notes

(1) This is true of some of our INSET participants. Spanish teachers of English in secondary schools, for example, because of the *Reforma* which has been introduced into the Spanish education system, can be more autonomous in their classes, and Project Work fulfills most, if not all, of the *Reforma* aims (Murillo, 1989).

(2) The two previous assignments are a report on the 'Language Learning Experience' (see Waters *et al*, 1990), and an essay applying a theoretical aspect of language or learning to the participant's own Home Teaching Situation). The content of the Project may well overlap with that of the other assignments. The Project is double-marked by course tutors--the Project Tutor and one other.

(3) Tutors' reasons for having the Project Presentation session were as follows:

Sharing of ideas

It makes the product important as well as the process.

It is a 'trial run' for talking about the ideas in the Project back home.

It provides an audience: sense of publication and recognition.

It gives participants a feeling that their Project is something of value.

It provides a <u>focus</u>: condensing Project into a poster forces participants to think about the main points and priorities i.e. what they will tell people at home their Project is 'about'

It's a sort of ritual: a climax, catharsis, a session where the Project is 'put to rest'; it also brings people together at a point in the course where this is important.

Participants want it.

In seeing what has been going on, it provides tutors with useful insights to follow up for future courses.

(4) Other 'initial reactions' were 'Curiosity/Interest' (16), 'A new experience' (12), 'Yet more work' (10), 'Pleasure' (8), 'Fear' (8) and 'Boredom' (2).
(5) The other reasons were 'inspired by a member of IELE staff' (3), 'inspired by a lecture' (7) and 'suggested by another course participant' (1).